

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-12 stand rejected.

II. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and for acknowledging receipt of the certified copies of the priority document.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 23, 2004.

However, the Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings filed on February 23, 2003 have been accepted. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the aforementioned drawings.

III. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention alleging that the title is not descriptive. Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's objections, Applicant has amended the title of the invention, as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure, alleging that it exceeds 150 words in length. Applicant has replaced the Abstract of the Disclosure with a new Abstract of the Disclosure having less than 150 words, as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiners objections to the Abstract of the Disclosure are now moot.

IV. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-12 alleging various informalities. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the claims are replete with grammatical errors including the lack of spacing between words and run-on sentences. Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's objections, Applicant has amended claims 1-12 to address any informalities, including grammatical errors. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

Applicant also notes that the Examiner has failed to point to any specific grammatical errors that are objectionable. Further, the MPEP requires that all claims must be drafted in the form of a single sentence and, thus, every claim is arguably, to some extent, a run-on sentence. Accordingly, if the Examiner persists in these claim objections, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically identify any grammatical errors that are alleged to be objectionable, along with the claim, line number including the alleged grammatical error, and the specific grounds of objection for each alleged grammatical error.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicant has amended claims 10-12, as set forth above. Applicant submits that amended claims 10-12 are directed to statutory subject matter and, thus, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0105678 to Shiraiwa (hereinafter “Shiraiwa”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Shiraiwa *at least* because Shiraiwa fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites (among other things):

...initially setting the role of said printing device as a communication slave while a connection is established with said first data source apparatus, and then switching the role of said printing device from a communication slave to a communication master to enable a connection to be established with both said first and second data source apparatuses...

Shiraiwa nowhere discloses or suggests these features. In contrast to claim 1, Shiraiwa merely discloses a process for switching whether the printer 1 functions as a host (master) or a function (slave) according to whether it is connected with the digital camera 29 or connected with the host computer (paragraph 0087; FIG. 6). In particular, Shiraiwa discloses discriminating, based on the status of connection pins of a USB cable, whether the connection is made with the cable 27 for connection with the digital camera serving as a function or with the cable 28 for connection with the host computer serving as a host (paragraph 0088; FIG. 6). That is, Shiraiwa merely discloses switching the function of the printer 1 according to the shape of the connector upon connection of the USB cable.

In sharp contrast to the recitations of claim 1, however, Shiraiwa provides no disclosure or suggestion regarding how, after the role of a first data source apparatus and the role of the printing device have been determined, because the first data source apparatus is already

connected, the role of the first data source apparatus and the role of the printing device are then switched when the printing device receives a connection request from a second apparatus, which is newly connected to the printing device. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Shiraiwa for *at least* these reasons.

Moreover, in view of the similarity between the recitations of claim 9 and the recitations discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1 also demonstrate the patentability of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

VII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shiraiwa and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0075510 to Martinez (hereinafter “Martinez”). Claims 4, 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shiraiwa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,718 to Hiraike et al. (hereinafter “Hiraike”). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shiraiwa, in view of Martinez, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0169880 to Nakanishi et al. (hereinafter “Nakanishi”). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shiraiwa, in view of Hiraike, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0286466 to Tagg et al. (hereinafter “Tagg”). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

In view of the similarity between the recitations of claims 10-12 and the recitations discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that reasons analogous to

those presented above regarding claim 1 also demonstrate the patentability of claims 10-12.

Thus, for *at least* reasons analogous to those presented above, Shiraiwa fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claims 10-12. Further, none of the other cited references remedies the deficient teachings of Shiraiwa. Therefore, claims 10-12 are patentable over the cited references for *at least* these reasons.

Moreover, the dependent claims 2-8 incorporate all the novel and nonobvious features of their base claim 1. For *at least* the reasons already discussed above, Shiraiwa fails to teach or suggest all the recitations of claim 1. Further, none of the cited references remedies the deficient teachings of Shiraiwa. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims 2-8 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency and requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

VIII. New Claims

New claims 13-17 have been added, as set forth above and are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added. For example, claims 13-14 are fully supported by *at least* FIG. 3 and the corresponding description provided in the original specification. Claim 15 is fully supported by *at least* pages 57-58 of the original specification. Further, claims 16-17 are fully supported by *at least* FIG. 7 and the corresponding description provided in the original specification.

IX. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/783,026

Attorney Docket No.: Q79962

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 14, 2008